



GAU-3712

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/542,674	
	Filing Date	04/01/00	
	First Named Inventor	Rouse, Groham M	
	Group Art Unit	3712	
	Examiner Name	FAYE FRANCIS	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	5	Attorney Docket Number	

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	(2 PAGE LETTER)
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	D Rouse Groham M. Rouse
Signature	D Rouse
Date	MAY 7, 2001

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: MAY 7, 2001			
Typed or printed name	Groham M. Rouse	Date	MAY 7, 2001
Signature	D Rouse		

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2001

Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Complete if Known

Application Number	09/542,674
Filing Date	04/01/00
First Named Inventor	ROUSE, Graham M.
Examiner Name	FAYE FRANCIS
Group Art Unit	3712
Attorney Docket No.	

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT	(\$) <u>195.00</u>
-------------------------	--------------------

METHOD OF PAYMENT

1. ☐ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayments to:

Deposit Account Number

Deposit Account Name

☐ Charge Any Additional Fee Required Under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

2. ☒ **Payment Enclosed:**

☒ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

				Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Description	Fee Paid
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)				
105	130	205	65			Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
127	50	227	25			Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
139	130	139	130			Non-English specification	
147	2,520	147	2,520			For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination	
112	920*	112	920*			Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
113	1,840*	113	1,840*			Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
115	110	215	55			Extension for reply within first month	
116	390	216	195			Extension for reply within second month	
117	890	217	445			Extension for reply within third month	
118	1,390	218	695			Extension for reply within fourth month	
128	1,890	228	945			Extension for reply within fifth month	
119	310	219	155			Notice of Appeal	
120	310	220	155			Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
121	270	221	135			Request for oral hearing	
138	1,510	138	1,510			Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
140	110	240	55			Petition to revive - unavoidable	
141	1,240	241	620			Petition to revive - unintentional	
142	1,240	242	620			Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
143	440	243	220			Design issue fee	
144	600	244	300			Plant issue fee	
122	130	122	130			Petitions to the Commissioner	
123	50	123	50			Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
126	180	126	180			Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
581	40	581	40			Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
146	710	246	355			Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	
149	710	249	355			For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))	
179	710	279	355			Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
169	900	169	900			Request for expedited examination of a design application	
Other fee (specify) _____							
SUBTOTAL (3)							(\$) <u>195.00</u>

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING FEE			
Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Description	Fee Paid
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)
101	710	201	355
106	320	206	160
107	490	207	245
108	710	208	355
114	150	214	75
SUBTOTAL (1)		(\$)	

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES			
Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee from below	Fee Paid
Independent Claims	-20** =	X	
Multiple Dependent	-3** =	X	

Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)		
103	18	203	9	Claims in excess of 20	
102	80	202	40	Independent claims in excess of 3	
104	270	204	135	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid	
109	80	209	40	** Reissue independent claims over original patent	
110	18	210	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent	
SUBTOTAL (2)		(\$)			

**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBMITTED BY		Complete (if applicable)	
Name (Print/Type)	Graham M. Rouse	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	Telephone 803 256 9743
Signature	<i>[Signature]</i>	Date	MAY 7, 2001

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



"Stretch Your Imagination" TM

2442 Wheat St., Columbia, SC 29205 USA

<http://rouseinternational.com>

430 Queen St.
Columbia, SC
29205

May 7, 2001

RK
6/5/01

#6/ELECTION

Ms Faye Francis
Art Unit 3712
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Re: Application # 09/542,674

Dear Ms. Francis:

This letter is in response to your office action regarding this application mailed 2/7/01.

FIRST ELECTION: I elect Group 1, the species shown in Figs 1 and 5.

SECOND ELECTION: I elect the species of anchor aperture shown in Fig 17.

THIRD ELECTION: I elect the species of end tab connector shown in Figs 20 and 21.

When you assigned "Groups", you specified Figs associated with those Groups. I did not find such specifications for your understanding of anchor aperture species or end tab connectors species. Figs 20 and 21 are closely related and fall under the same claims description. This description occurs in claims #11 (1), #14 (1), and # 16 (1). It reads:

"(1) sections of framing material having notches, wrap around other sections of framing material having notches in such a way as to interlock;"

My understanding of the situation regarding the THIRD ELECTION above is described in the paragraph below. Please advise me if this is correct. If it is not correct, please explain what is correct.

While it is possible that there may be notch systems which are patentably distinct from this pair and it may be possible that each would be considered patentably distinct if filed separately; in this case, both illustrated examples fall within the generic claim "(1)" in the paragraph above. As such, I understand that both configurations might be allowed under "(1)" above. If prior art were to be found eliminating one, then "(1)" above might be revised to limit the claim to the remaining configuration.

Based on my understanding of your description of patentably distinct species, here is my understanding of the claims that read on the elected species above:

FIRST ELECTION:

- Claim 1
- Claim 2
- Claim 11

SECOND ELECTION:

I understand that within Claims 1,2, and 11 it is your present intention to research only the one species of anchor aperture (being that species shown in Fig 17).

THIRD ELECTION:

I understand that within Claims 1,2, and 11 it is your present intention to research only the one species of end tab connectors (being that species shown in Figs 20 and 21).

I have made, above, the elections as required by your office action dated February 5, 2001 and mailed February 7, 2001.

I wish to respectfully submit, however, that Claims 1, 12 and 15 are generic claims that appropriately encompass the "patentably distinct species" you identified in your correspondence.

Each of the species you identify is presented in my application as dependent upon all the restrictions of its "parent" or independent claim. Since all of the species have the common restrictions of the parent claim/s, I understand that the parent claim/s are therefore generic and may appropriately be researched as a unit without the necessity of an election restriction.

I would like to, and plan to, do additional research on the matter and submit further information and arguments in support of my position. I will, however, do that under separate cover as I am eager to file this response today so as to avoid unnecessary extension fees.

Successfully,



Graham Rouse